	1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE WESTERN DIVISION
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	Plaintiff,
6	vs.   NO. 23-CR-20121
7	ASHLEY GRAYSON AND   JOSHUA GRAYSON,
8	Defendants.
9	Detendants.
10	
11	
12	
13	TRANSCRIPT OF THE TRIAL
14	BEFORE THE
15	HONORABLE JON P. MCCALLA
16	
17	PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS
18	
19	TUESDAY
20	MARCH 26, 2024
21	
22	
23	TINA DuBOSE GIBSON, RPR, RCR
24	OFFICIAL REPORTER FOURTH FLOOR FEDERAL BUILDING
25	MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38103
	UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT
_	ONKENVELEN LIVANOCITEL

2 APPEARANCES 1 2 3 Appearing on behalf of the Government: 4 PATRICK NEAL OLDHAM BRYCE PHILLIPS 5 United States Attorney's Office 167 N. Main Street, Suite 800 6 Memphis, Tennessee 38103 (901) 544-4231 7 neal.oldham@usdoj.gov bryce.phillips@usdoj.gov 8 9 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant Ashley Grayson: 10 SCOTT H. PALMER MICHAEL LEVINE 11 Scott H. Palmer, PC 15455 Dallas Parkway Suite 540 12 Dallas, Texas 75001 13 (214) 987-4100 scott.palmer@palmerperlstein.com 14 michael.levine@palmerperlstein.com 15 LESLIE I. BALLIN 16 Ballin, Ballin & Fishman, PC 200 Jefferson Avenue 17 Suite 1250 Memphis, Tennessee 38103-2007 18 (901) 525-6278 lballin@bbfpc.com 19 20 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant Joshua Grayson: 21 MICHAEL E. SCHOLL 22 The Scholl Law Firm 200 Jefferson Avenue 23 Suite 1500 Memphis, Tennessee 38103 2.4 (901) 529-8500 mike@scholl-law-firm.com 25

TUESDAY

MARCH 26, 2024

THE COURT: Everyone can be seated. Ladies and gentlemen, you're now the jury in this case. I'm going to take a few minutes -- it's actually a little longer -- to tell you something about your duties as jurors and to give you some preliminary instructions.

At the end of the trial, I will give you detailed instructions on the law, and those instructions will control your deliberations. These are merely for your guidance.

They're important, but they are for your guidance so that you can make sense of materials as they're submitted. At the end of the case, again, I will give you detailed instructions on the law, and those instructions are the instructions you must follow in making your decision in this case.

This is a criminal case brought by the United States Government, and the charges contained against the defendants are contained in the indictment. And while I've read it to you a long time ago, I'll read it to you again.

Again, it's short, the length doesn't make any difference, and it's not binding on you in any way. It's not evidence.

As we talked about, it's just a way to give notice as to what the charges are.

The indictment in this case reads as follows:

On or about August 26 of 2022, and continuing
until on or about September 11, 2022, in the Western District
of Tennessee and elsewhere, the defendants, Ashley Grayson
and Joshua Grayson, together with others known and unknown to
the grand jury, did knowingly and intentionally conspire to
use and cause another to use a facility of interstate
commerce, to wit, a cell phone with the intent that the
murder of DH, a real person known to the grand jury, be
committed in violation of the law of the State of
Mississippi. And as consideration for the receipt of and
promise and agreement to pay money, and other items of
pecuniary value, all in violation of Title 18 United States
Code Section 1958.

Now, those are the charges in this case, and each defendant has pled not guilty to the charge contained in the indictment. And each defendant is presumed by the law to be innocent unless and until proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. It will be your duty to decide from the evidence to be presented whether the defendant that you're considering — remember, we consider each defendant separately — whether the defendant that you are considering is guilty or not guilty of the crime charged.

You will decide from the evidence what the facts are, and your verdict will be based on those facts. You are

the sole judges of the facts. You must then apply those facts to the law as I give it to you, and in that way reach your verdict. You must follow the law whether you agree with it or not.

You should not take anything that I may say or do during the trial as indicating what I think of the evidence for what your verdict should be. In fact, I will endeavor not to say anything to suggest that because that is your decision and your decision alone.

The defendants have been charged with a single crime in this case, and there are two defendants in this case, but as we've already said, they are to be tried separately. That is, the Government has a burden of proving as to each defendant the facts necessary to establish beyond a reasonable doubt the Government's asserted claim, that is, the indicted charge against that defendant.

It is correct that your decision on one defendant, whatever it is, guilty or not guilty, should not influence your decision on the other defendant. In other words, you really do keep them separate, and you have to decide them individually.

Now, some of the people who might have been charged in this case will not be going on trial. I don't know if we'll hear from anybody in that category, but I'm looking to everybody to make sure I understand that. You may

hear some other names. That doesn't matter. There's no requirement that all members or all participants in a crime or a conspiracy be charged and prosecuted or tried together. So do not be concerned about that.

I'm going to go over in a moment the elements of the offense, and I'll tell you about them. But, again, at the end of the case, you'll get a detailed set of instructions, and you get a written set of instructions for all of you to refer to. So those are the instructions you'll rely on. These are simply to help you as you go through the process of listening to the case. As you know, of course, the indictment is no evidence of guilt at all.

Now, the Government has a strict or heavy burden in this case, but I'm going to tell you at the outset the general instruction on burden of proof. The Government does have a strict or heavy burden, and that's proper for anyone to point that out, and the Government has to accept that and acknowledge that. But it's not necessary that a defendant — an individual defendant's guilt be proved beyond all possible doubt. It's only required that the Government's proof exclude any reasonable doubt concerning a defendant's guilt.

A reasonable doubt is a real doubt based upon reason and common sense after careful and impartial consideration of all of the evidence in the case. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, is proof of such a

convincing character that you would be willing to rely and act upon it without hesitation in the most important of your own affairs.

At the end of the case, after you've considered all the evidence and deliberated among yourselves, if you are convinced that the defendant has been proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should say so. And if you're not convinced, you should say so also.

During the case, you've already heard references to evidence. Now, evidence is defined so that we have reliable information to submit to the jury. The term "evidence" includes the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits admitted in the record, any facts as to which the parties stipulate. I'm not sure there will be any stipulations. They aren't required to. But sometimes there's stipulations. That is, we agree that such and such is a fact. It's not necessary to put any proof on about that and any facts as to which the Court takes judicial notice.

Of course, remember that anything the lawyers say, with all due respect to the lawyers, is not evidence in the case. And that's already -- the point has been made in the voir dire process.

It is your own recollection and interpretation of the evidence that controls the case. And, of course, what the lawyers say, it's not going to be binding on you. In

considering the evidence -- by the way, about judicial notice, so it doesn't sound like I really can do very much. I can only take judicial notice of the fact that it's so obvious that, frankly, all of you would know. So I can take judicial notice that Memphis, Tennessee, is in the Western District of Tennessee. You don't really need any help on that one.

I can actually take judicial notice of days on a calendar. Now, I have to check and make sure that all of it is right, but if I'm asked to take judicial notice that a certain day was a Thursday or Friday or Sunday, I can take judicial notice of that. It's another very ascertainable fact, but I cannot take judicial notice of anything that really is capable of being disputed. I cannot do that.

Now, in considering the evidence in the case, you will have to make deductions and reach conclusions which reason and common sense lead you to make. And you should not be concerned about whether the evidence is direct evidence or circumstantial evidence. And this is an important concept, so you need to know it at the outset.

Of course, direct evidence is the testimony by one who asserts actual knowledge of a fact such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of a chain of facts and circumstances, indicating that a defendant is either guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction

between direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Of course, it is up to you, the jury, to decide how much weight to give to any evidence.

You should also, as I've indicated, you should also not assume from anything that I may say or do, that I have any position or wish to convey any position concerning any evidence in the case. I will, however, give you instructions sometimes if evidence cannot be received for a particular reason. And we'll talk about that in a moment.

In saying that you must consider all of the evidence, I do not mean that you must accept all of the evidence as true and accurate. You should decide in this case -- and you will need to decide in this case -- whether you believe each witness, whether you believe what each witness has to say, and how important that witness's testimony was. In making that decision, you may believe or disbelieve any witness in whole or in part.

Also, the number of witnesses testifying concerning any particular dispute is not controlling. You may decide that the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses concerning any fact in dispute is more believable than the testimony of a larger number of witnesses to the contrary.

In deciding whether you believe or disbelieve any witness, I suggest that you ask yourself a few questions:

Did the witness impress you as one who was telling the truth? Did the witness have any particular reason not to tell the truth? Did the witness have a personal interest in the outcome of the case? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? Did the witness have the opportunity and ability to observe accurately the things the witness testified about? Did the witness appear to understand the questions clearly and answer them directly?

Would you like some water? Are you okay?

THE JUROR: I'm just getting a little warm, and it makes me cough.

THE COURT: Okay. No, I will tell you we're not here to make your lives miserable, and so we do let you bring a bottle of water in here. We don't let you bring coffee, tea, or things that have color in it because they replace this carpet about once every 35 years. And so we can't do that. But tell us, if you need something, and we will try to take care of it.

We're talking about evaluating a witness's testimony and credibility. You will want to also ask: Did the witness's testimony differ from the testimony of other witnesses or from the evidence and testimony that you do believe? You should ask yourself whether the evidence tends to prove that a witness has intentionally testified falsely or whether the evidence simply shows that the witness said

something or failed to say something or do something which is simply a mistake or error. So you have to use common sense in evaluating testimony.

To put it more directly, you should keep in mind that a simple mistake by a witness does not necessarily mean that the witness was not telling the truth as that witness remembers it because people naturally tend to forget some things or remember other things inaccurately.

So if a witness has made a misstatement, you need to consider whether the misstatement was simply an innocent lapse of memory or an intentional falsehood, and that may depend on whether the testimony was as to an important fact or only an unimportant detail.

I will remind you at this time -- and I do not know what the final instruction will be on this, but I want you to remember at all times, that each defendant is here individually. Each defendant has an absolute right not to testify guaranteed by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The fact that a witness may not testify cannot be considered by you in any way. Do not even discuss it in your deliberations. Remember at all times that it is up to the Government to prove each defendant individually guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. It is not up to an individual defendant to prove that he or she is innocent.

At the end of the case, I'm going to give you

some additional instructions along this line, but I think we'll wait because this gives you the idea of what we're doing.

Now, there will be witnesses other than, obviously, the -- well, we don't know who will testify, but there will be witnesses who may be subject to the analysis in terms of whether to believe them or not. That's what we're talking about really earlier. So just keep that in mind.

There will be some law enforcement witnesses that will testify. Now, we all know that we shouldn't treat them differently from other witnesses. They don't get special extra treatment or negative treatment. Law enforcement witnesses are someone who is employed by the city, the county, the state, or federal government in the operation of enforcement of the laws of the United States.

That doesn't mean that his or her testimony is deserving of more or less consideration or greater or lesser weight than that of an ordinary witness. So in reviewing the testimony of the law enforcement witnesses, you would give to that testimony the same type of consideration that we talked about earlier.

There may be some testimony from someone who may testify -- I'm not sure about this -- as an opinion witness, a person who by education or qualification is able to give an opinion on a particular fact in the case.

Now, if that happens, you just have to remember a couple of things. You cannot let that person substitute their opinion for your judgment because you make a decision as to all the facts. You do not have to accept the testimony of an opinion witness. It will be up to you to decide how much weight to give such testimony, if any. And, of course, you will want to consider, if you reach those questions, the witness's qualifications and how that particular witness reached that witness's conclusions.

Also consider the other factors that we talked about in weighing the credibility of witnesses if someone is allowed to express an opinion on an issue before you.

There may be some testimony about other acts that may have been committed by someone in the case. If that occurs, I will give you some special instructions about how you should deal with that at the time. We all understand that this is about the charge contained in the indictment, and it is not about whether somebody did something five years ago or ten years ago in this case. It's simply not going to have application generally.

So if it does occur, and that's allowed, I will give you some specific instructions after counsel have made a certain showing as to how you might consider that additional testimony about what we sometimes refer to as other acts by either a witness or someone else.

At the end of the case, you're going to have to decide this case based on what you hear and see here in the courtroom and based on the exhibits that are received. That is based on the evidence in the case. You may hear some recorded testimony, but always remember that if you do hear that, it is not what somebody says the recording says, it is what you can ascertain it says. I hope that makes sense. In other words, you have to listen to it and make sure that you understand what that was.

Also at the end of the case, you're not going to have a transcript even though I can read almost everything that's said in the courtroom up here. That technology is not something that we make available to you -- and we can make it available to counsel, but they have to make arrangements for it -- yet, and that's because it's just an initial draft transcript. So we don't have a chance to give you a full transcript, so you're not going to get a transcript.

There's another reason. It takes about two hours of work to prepare a single hour of testimony from the Court, so it would be a long time waiting on the transcript. And the next thing is that a transcript doesn't show the way the person said it. It only shows the words on the page. And every last one of you has been in a conversation with someone in which they ended up saying yes or no to part of the conversation, but you actually understood that it meant the

opposite. It didn't really mean yes or no. It actually meant an affirmative or negative because of the way that conversation evolved, and you could see them and you could understand them. So sometimes even words as simple as yes or no can be misconstrued if you're just looking at a transcript. And can you imagine what it's like when you have longer answers with more complicated inflexion, pauses, and so forth.

So you don't get a transcript because that would take away a fundamental function of the jury, which is to listen to the testimony and to make your own determination about what you believe and do not believe and also to use your common sense as you listen to it so you can understand what the actual meaning is. That's very important. So we don't make a transcript available.

There will be a day sometime in the next, you know, years where we may be able to do something differently, but we cannot really do that now. So you're not going to get a transcript. So what are you going to do?

First of all, you're going to listen really carefully and make your decision based on what is said and observed here in the courtroom, but we do allow you to take notes. Somebody brought a notepad out with them. That's fine. You don't need to take notes during my part because I give you written instructions later on. You are allowed to

take notes. Sometimes that's helpful, but I'm going to tell you a couple things about that.

The first thing is that at the end of the trial, you're going to get a document, a list. It's called a witness list and exhibit list. It's going to list each of the witnesses who testified. So you don't really -- I mean, you can write it down if you want to. That's perfectly fine, but you're going to get an official list.

The second thing is that that list will also include a list of the exhibits. So you don't have to write that down. You're going to know what the exhibits are.

You're also going to get the exhibits themselves. And if the exhibits include something that's recorded, you'll get the ability to play it back. So you're going to get all of those things. So you need to be mindful that those are things that you're going to have to let you refresh your memory as you go back through and make your decisions.

But do remember that you need to pay close attention to testimony that's given because that is what you're going to have to rely on in making your ultimate decisions in this case.

All of you know that you should not take as evidence any statements of counsel made during the trial. If counsel stipulates to a fact -- and I'm not aware that they will be, but I'll look out there one more time, and they

might later on. If they stipulate to a fact, then that fact will be stated to have been stipulated to or admitted by counsel, and you may regard that fact as conclusively established with no further proof required in the case.

As to questions that are asked, listen carefully. As to any question that is asked as to which an objection is sustained, you must not speculate as to what the answer would have been. And you must assume that the answer would be of no value to you.

You may not consider for any purpose any insinuation of a question. The fact is questions are not evidence. The answer is the evidence. And if there's a misconnect between the question and the answer, you can only consider the answer. You can consider the answer when they connect to each other for the purpose of helping to understand, that is, understanding what the answer was.

But if somebody asks a question and the witness goes off on some nonrelated subject, then we don't consider the question. We can consider the response, but, of course, it's problematic if the witness is doing that. And we'll try to deal with that if necessary. So you must never speculate to be true any suggestion by a question asked a witness. The question is not evidence and is only to be considered as it gives meaning to the answer.

Now, I read the indictment to you earlier. And

I'm going to tell you about the law that generally applies in this area. By the way, at the end of the case, you'll consider all the evidence that you have in the case. You will want to do that. And the indictment in this case is we've referred to it as a murder for hire case.

Now, it's got kind of an inflammatory sound, so don't let that affect you. The questions is: Are the elements that are required to be proven, proven by the Government with proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Count 1, the only count in this case, accuses the defendants of conspiring with each other and with others known and unknown to use and cause use of a facility of interstate commerce, a cell phone, with the intent that the murder of DH be committed in violation of the law of the State of Mississippi. And as consideration for the receipt of and promise and agreement to pay money and other items of pecuniary value in violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 1958, in order to be found guilty of that offense, the Government has to prove certain elements or components beyond a reasonable doubt. Each one has to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

First, that the defendant that you're considering -- I'm going to say it that way a lot of times because it has to be specific as to each defendant -- as to the defendant that you're considering, conspired to cause

another person to use a facility of interstate commerce, essentially a cell phone.

Second, that the defendant did so -- the defendant you're considering did so with the intent that a murder be committed in violation of the laws of the State of Mississippi. And that's got the intent component. That was not by accident or mistake. It was with the intent that a murder be committed in violation of the laws of the State of Mississippi.

And, third, that the murder was to be committed as consideration for the promise or agreement to pay something of pecuniary value. You were going to pay something for it or transfer something for it or give some type of consideration for it, but that the murder was to be committed as consideration for the promise or agreement to pay anything of pecuniary value. It could be money. It could be other things that you were going to get in connection with an agreement to commit that crime.

Now, a conspiracy is a kind of criminal partnership, and I'm going to say this to be really clear. A marriage is a kind of partnership, but that's not what we're talking about. That's not the same thing. The fact that you're married to somebody does not meet this definition.

And, Mr. Scholl, did I get that right?

MR. SCHOLL: Absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, and the thing is we try to be very clear about that throughout.

A conspiracy is a kind of criminal partnership.

For you to find a defendant guilty of this crime, the

Government must prove each and every one of the following

elements beyond a reasonable doubt, and this relates to

conspiracy. That's a component of what we're taking about.

So what you've got is components, three of them, and then you

can have components within that. It's kind of like, if you

did a diagram in high school or earlier of a sentence, so

we're going to break that down.

First, that two or more people conspired or agreed to commit the crime of murder for hire. So you have to have an agreement. It's not formal. You don't have to have a document. In fact, almost no conspiracies have something like -- some might, but almost none have something like that. But two or more people agreed to commit the crime of murder for hire. They conspired to do so.

Well, the second thing is that the defendant that you're considering knowingly and voluntarily joined the conspiracy. Now, they can be part of the conspiracy from the very beginning. In fact, they could be the first two people. But the person you're considering has to have become part of that, whether they are from the very beginning or whether they're a little later on.

Third, that a member of the conspiracy did something, some act described for the purpose of advancing or helping the conspiracy.

Now, I'm going to talk about counsel about some of these instructions because they've submitted them to me, and I may refine them a little later on because there may be a little nuance that we have to correct here.

But the idea is we've got -- like a recipe, we have pieces that have to all be present and within that one component, that one part of the recipe, there are a couple of more components. And so it's like a checklist. You have to have each one shown with proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

We'll talk about other things at the end of the case, probably something about pecuniary value. That's probably pretty obvious to all of us, but we will talk about that at the time. I think everybody is probably not going to have much dispute about what a cell phone is, an interstate facility, and that sort of thing, but we'll talk about that a little bit more.

Now, what about murder in Mississippi? Is murder in Mississippi different from murder in Tennessee? I hope not. I certainly hope it's the same, essentially.

Under the Mississippi law, murder is defined as unlawfully and with deliberate design killing a human being.

Now, they're not saying somebody was killed here, but they're

saying there was murder for hire. I'm trying to have somebody killed.

Generally, in this instruction as to Mississippi law, deliberate design means a person decides to unlawfully kill another person, and there is no legal justification or justifiable reason for doing so. Now, that last sounds like a big hole, but it's really -- we'll have to talk about that more at the end of the case. I mean, you don't get to kill something because you don't like them. That's not a legal justification. It has -- it would have to be usually something akin to -- I'm not saying it would be -- something like self-defense, and it wouldn't really fit here very well. But it has to be some legally justifiable action.

So in this instruction in connection with Mississippi law, deliberate design means a person decides to unlawfully kill another person for no reason that's defensible. The decision to kill a person can be formed very quickly, and we need to understand that. It may occur only moments before the actual act of killing. Now, again, that's the idea what would constitute murder for hire. However, deliberate design cannot be formed at the exact moment of the actual killing. So it's already designed. It's a -- how do you put it? It's like a plan. A deliberate decision to have somebody killed, to kill someone.

At the end of the case, we'll give you more

detailed instructions on these concepts. You'll have those before you as you make your decision. You'll also have to think, obviously, about what's the mental state of the person who is making these decisions, right? because if you're intentionally doing something, it's a mental issue for the jury to decide.

Well, I want going to explain something. A reminder to all of you of something you probably know already. Ordinarily, there is no way that a defendant's state of mind can be proved directly because, in fact, at this point in time in our history, no one can read another person's mind and tell what that person is thinking. Now, I know someone might challenge me on that, but the fact is we're not quite there yet.

So we start there. We're not mind readers. So how is this going to be proven? How would the Government have to prove this? Well, I suppose if they could have a recording that says, I'm going to kill somebody, that might be important.

But a defendant's state of mind can be proved indirectly from the surrounding circumstances. This includes something like what the person said, what the person did, how the person acted, and any other facts or circumstances in evidence that show what was in the defendant's mind.

Of course, you may consider the natural and

probable results of any acts of the defendant you're considering knowingly did or did not do and whether it is reasonable to conclude that the defendant intended those results. And this, of course, is all for you to decide. So there are ways to prove this. And you still have to ask yourself at the end: Has the Government met that burden with proof beyond a reasonable doubt?

There is no requirement that the entire conspiracy take place here in West Tennessee. But for you to return a verdict on the conspiracy charge, the way it's charged here at this point in time, the Government must convince you that either the agreement or one of the acts in furtherance of the conspiracy took place in West Tennessee, there has to be a connection to the Western District of Tennessee.

We've gone over a number of things already, and I'm going to recheck. But I want to remind you again that these are very preliminary instructions. They are designed to help you listen to the case. There will be a clear set of instructions at the end after we've conferred with counsel and those instructions are the ones that you should follow in determining your verdict in this case.

Now, there's seven things that I have to tell you about, and you know them already.

The first thing is you cannot discuss the case

among yourselves. And that makes sense. There's no preliminary deliberation. You're not allowed. Well, that's a good thing because that means that you have to listen to everything and have final arguments and final instruction where you can talk among yourselves about the case.

Absolutely no discussions among yourselves.

Second thing, there's absolutely no discussion with family and friends and somebody you see at home or somebody you usually call when you get home. Or, you know, a relative that you see regularly. Even your spouse, you cannot talk with them about the case. That's a prohibition. It's really important. So after you hear the first witness today, you may be tempted to go talk about the case. And the answer is absolutely do not do it. Absolutely do not do it.

What do you do if somehow you give into that temptation, what do you do? You come tell me about it. I am not going to get mad at you. Of course, you might not be on the jury any longer. I've got to think about that. That will be a different thing. But we understand people are people, so what we want you to do is to be transparent, to tell me. And I'll be okay. And you'll be okay. But the critical thing is that the process will be honored.

So when you go home and your significant other says, tell me about the case, and you say, I can't tell you, and they say, you must not love me anymore, then just tell

26

them, I can't, I can't do it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The third thing is that you cannot speak to the witnesses, lawyers, or parties at all. Now, I'm going to tell you a little nuance there. Obviously, you can't have direct contact at all. There's no speaking to them, there's no contact with them, anything like that. That also includes that in the courtroom, the only way we receive testimony from anybody is from the witness stand.

I am often reminded of a case long ago now, which these prosecutors are too young to remember, in which they brought in a codefendant who was a very large guy. And the opposite counsel said, Judge, we'd like to mark Mr. Wilson as an exhibit in the case. We can't do that. But that's an illustration that even what you see in the courtroom from prosecution table and defense table is not evidence. And I have to tell you that because that's not fair to anybody to make it that way. So that's just not evidence. The evidence comes in from the witness stand. So if somebody tries to say, well, I was looking out in the courtroom, and I saw such and such, if it's something that you can consider, counsel will approach me, and they will say, Judge, this occurred, the jury saw it, you need to instruct them that they can't actually consider that. But, otherwise, you can't consider it. You can't consider it.

Well, the next thing is that you can't -- there

should be -- is there still that placard in the back that tells you what you can't do. It supposed to be green. It used to be green. Still there? Good. It needs to be bigger, but I agree.

You cannot do any research or make any inquiry at all. I'm going over this kind of carefully. This will be the last time to do that. You cannot do that at all. So no research or inquiry. You now know enough to be curious enough to be, if you're like me -- I'm not tempted to because I don't need to, but it used to be everybody just go to Google and look it up, right? And you cannot do that, so here's not inquiry at all.

There's a famous case in Virginia in which the jury decided that they didn't understand one of the terms that had been used in court. And so they got a Webster's dictionary, and they looked up the term in Webster's dictionary. The problem was, one, you're not allowed to do it.

The second problem was that the definition in Webster's dictionary was not the legal definition. It was wrong. And so you look at a wrong definition, you're applying the wrong definition, and you can't do that. So that's an emphasis, a way to think about it. Can't do it at all. It's a relief to you, can't do it.

The sixth thing is avoid things from the media

# PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS

that's okay. That's fine.

about this case or cases like it. I'm not telling you there will be something. I don't now. There could be, though. It wouldn't be unusual. But if you see something about this case, you absolutely need to tell me, right? And you're just going to tell Mr. Sample or the court security officer, and they're going to come say, our juror in Seat Number 8 needs to come see, you, and he's going to tell you about it. And

If you do see something, though, you must tell me about it, but I'm going to suggest that you avoid things like that. And if there's a special Law and Order episode that emphasizes — none of you watch Law or Order, right? But any that emphasizes murder for hire, the answer is, please don't watch it right now because it can affect your ability to be fair and impartial.

Okay. The last thing is I need you to keep an open mind. I need you to keep and open mind throughout these proceedings until you've heard the final arguments of counsel, the final instructions of the law, which are going to vary a little bit from what you've heard because I'm going to add some details, take out a few things here and there. Those will control your deliberations. And then you'll go to the jury room, and the first thing you'll do is not vote. That would be terrible, right? Completely avoids the whole process because you have to deliberate.

How many watched 12 Angry Men? Oh, that's too old for you guys. Maybe not. Okay. Well, the point is that there has to be a discussion. And you all have to discuss it together. You have to listen to each other, and you learn from each other's observations and then -- and I'm talking only about the evidence and the law. We're not talking about something that happened to you personally. And then and only then do you attempt to reach your own mind as to what the verdict should be as to each individual defendant. And then what the jury verdict should be.

Well, we've taken some time on this because this is my last opportunity to tell you really much of anything in this regard until we get to the final instructions. We're going to speak briefly to counsel at side-bar and see if they want me to add something, and then we're going to take about a 20-minute break, and there will be some things that have to happen during that period of time. And then we'll proceed with opening statements. So let me see counsel briefly at side-bar.

(At side-bar on the record.)

THE COURT: I wish I could make those really short and I'll just give them a pill and move on, but I can't.

Okay. Mr. Ballin, what do we need to add?

MR. BALLIN: Things that I do and say in court

are to properly represent my client, so what I'm about to say is toward that goal.

THE COURT: Okay. Sure.

MR. BALLIN: If I can voice an objection on behalf of Defendant Ashley Grayson to the Court's preliminary, instruction, specifically, when you talked about the state of mind of the defendant, that we don't have science to mind read.

THE COURT: No, we don't.

MR. BALLIN: That's not the problematic part of it, but it's the preliminary part that we say is objectionable and that I do object to.

You followed that up with an example of how to prove a defendant's state of mind.

THE COURT: Potential evidence.

MR. BALLIN: The example you gave was a recorded statement. In this particular case, because of the pretrial issues that we had, it's known to all, respectfully, the Court included, that there was going to be a video played. It's our position that Your Honor giving the example of how to prove the state of mind of the defendant is an improper comment on the evidence.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BALLIN: And I would respectfully ask that this Court declare a mistrial.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

31

1 THE COURT: I can tell them to disregard it too. 2 I can do that. 3 MR. BALLIN: It's already out, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Well, believe me, if I tell them to 5 disregard it, I'm confident they will. 6 MR. SCHOLL: I join in that objection, Your 7 Honor. THE COURT: 8 Okay. Comment? 9 MR. OLDHAM: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. What do we need to do?

MR. OLDHAM: Your Honor, I believe that a curative instruction from the Court addressing -- or a curative pretrial instruction from the Court addressing

Mr. Ballin's concern could alleviate the concern of speaking of the Court, that's a generic example and has no bearing on this case.

Maybe give another example that doesn't then bring in any of the facts in this case. But I think this early on and with this process and the jury knowing that you're telling them something this early on, I think that could be curative.

THE COURT: Okay. And what do you want me to say? I'm pretty good at getting that part right if you just let me know.

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, since we were already

# PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS

going to take a 20-minute recess, could we have just a few moments to confer with our office and then we might have potentially something additional, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I mean, there's going to be a big issue about the tape, right?

MR. BALLIN: It is the biggest concern.

THE COURT: I wasn't trying to tell them what's going to be proven. I'm trying to alert them so that they're not surprised. It's one of those things -- so you want me to tell them something more specific or less specific or just not at all?

MR. BALLIN: It's our position the harm has been done, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, let's talk about curing the problem.

MR. BALLIN: I hear Your Honor's question about how to cure the problem, and I appreciate the Court considering curing the problem. Our main and primary response is to grant the mistrial.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BALLIN: As to how the cure the problem, I defer to the Court.

THE COURT: Do you want to say something?

MR. PALMER: I join everything that Mr. Ballin is saying. I don't know with that comment, you can unring that

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

bell, that any curative instruction would be --

THE COURT: Sometimes -- let me tell what you we do. Sometimes because it's a preliminary instruction, we don't say anything because we don't want to draw undue attention to something. So that's a concern. You're always thinking about that. Are you going to cause undue attention to be drawn to it? I can say, "Look, disregard that. I didn't need to say that. That was inappropriate. Just don't think about it at all." I think I think they would do that. I'm not worried about that. Jurors are pretty good at that. But the main thing is it's a preliminary instruction. It's not binding in any way on you. I could always do that.

MR. SCHOLL: I'm concerned that, respectfully, Judge, that the problem is with this case, is that the -- really, I don't think anybody would disagree with me the biggest piece of evidence in this case is that video. And the biggest part of the defense is lack of intent. And now the jury has been given information that they can infer intent from a recording.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCHOLL: So that would be the concern, at least with regards to as I would voice it.

THE COURT: Okay. What do you think about that? Anything else?

MR. BALLIN: I honor Mr. Phillips asking for a

moment for them to confer and possibly for us to confer.

MR. OLDHAM: Would that be allowed, Your Honor, that during this break you were going to take anyways for us to be able to confer to see if there's any other remedy that we can --

not for the purpose of instructing the jury. They're solely for the purpose of giving the jury some guidance. And I don't think it's inappropriate to alert the jury that they may want to be sensitive about things that might come up, so that's not the problem.

The problem is the suggestion that I'm saying that would prove intent, which it would not. It's not necessarily going to prove that at all. And I understand -- right? And I understand that. Unless you think it is going to prove it, then I would be very interested in --

MR. PALMER: That's, I think, our concern.

THE COURT: You would agree that the jury could reject that and decide there's no intent?

MR. BALLIN: That's our concern that Your Honor has given an example of how to prove the defendant's intent.

THE COURT: Well, I understand what you're saying. Okay. I understand that. And the question is then: What do you do -- one, again, it's preliminary, how do you best address that? Of course, it is correct that you could

prove it through use of a recording, right? I mean, that would be wrong not to say --

MR. BALLIN: It would be Your Honor commenting on the evidence.

THE COURT: No, no, no, I'm not saying that. I'm mean, I'm just saying a matter of fact and law, that would be a way to do it. I'm not saying I'm going to use it. I'm just asking. I think there is a way you can do it.

I know he needs to turn that tie around. We've been watching the whole time.

So let's just figure out what we need to say.

MR. OLDHAM: Your Honor, I think since you've used that as an example, maybe you could give a couple of other examples. I just think it important they hear some other examples this could be proved. This isn't the only way.

THE COURT: What other example do you want to suggest?

MR. PHILLIPS: I think that's the 20-minute recess.

MR. PALMER: We've discussed at length between counsel that without the video, this case would most likely not be prosecuted.

MR. OLDHAM: That's the whole crime, Your Honor. We would argue that there's some other things, but the

evidence upon which we are relying the most is that one video that's split into two segments.

THE COURT: What I've always understood is that you were going to attack the veracity of that video, and you were going to have an expert who is going to testify about that.

MR. PALMER: Sure.

THE COURT: And, therefore, that's not a concluded item.

MR. LEVINE: That's not really accurate, Your Honor. Respectfully, that's a very small part of our defense. The larger part, the greater weight of our defense is going to her lack of intent.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. SCHOLL: And the problem is I don't think --

THE COURT: I mean, I'm not disagreeing with you.

I think that's more my perspective, which it's just a piece.

18 | It's not a conclusion.

MR. SCHOLL: I think that the thing that gets attacked on the video is whether it's been spliced or partially missing some of it. The part that you actually see on the video, I don't think that's being to be any argument that it's been edited at least that part. The video is not of my client, but I don't think there's going to be -- there will be an argument from us that this was ever edited as far

as what was being said on the video. Now, maybe that is a portion of what the whole conversation was, but what is being said on the video, I don't believe is -- my understanding is there's not going to be any dispute that it's going to be --

THE COURT: Problematic.

MR. SCHOOL: -- what she said.

THE COURT: I understand what you're saying. Let me see if we can handle it this way.

(End of discussion at side-bar.)

THE COURT: I need to clarify something that we went over earlier, and that is we were talking about intent. I probably gave an example that's not really appropriate to have given in this case, so I want you to rethink that.

I'm going to tell you about some uses of video in previous cases, not in this case. Not in this case at all.

We just tried a case not long ago in which there were multiple both video recordings and silent recordings. Some didn't have audio. Some did. It was a multiple -- it had multiple charges in the case, a lot of things going on. And sometimes you couldn't tell exactly what was going on.

But in that case, there was one little piece of evidence that showed up in several videos, and that was a particular black Impala. And part of the thing was where was the defendant? Was the defendant there or not there? Well, I'm not sure. I don't know. But part of the circumstantial

evidence was that a black Impala owned or having -- the defendant having access to because it's actually owned by someone else but having access to was in these locations, actually, in the locations on some occasions in front of the facility or store that was robbed.

Well, did that say that the defendant was there?

No. That was -- not really. We didn't see the defendant.

We saw a black Impala that he had access to and that he could drive. Well, that was a piece of the case. The question was did he -- was he there and did he have the intent to commit these particular offenses, but it was mainly was he present?

So circumstantial evidence does not necessarily tell you what actually happens, right? But it tells you that it is a fact from which you may draw another conclusion. You may draw the conclusion that this was a totally different person totally unrelated to this case, that he was there. You may draw the conclusion that there are lots of black Impalas in Memphis, Tennessee that look like this car. There's just not enough proof to show that he was there. It's far from conclusive on that question. So that can be circumstantial evidence that suggests that you might draw that inference, but you sure want to look at lot of other material.

Now, any reference that I made earlier to any video or tape or recording, I'm going to ask you to disregard

that. Just don't think about it. That is not before you at this time, and we're going to wait and see and I don't know what will happen in this case. And I'm not even saying that is a basis or sufficient basis to draw any conclusion about anything. I just don't know. I just don't know. And thank goodness, I don't have to make those decisions.

So if somebody says, well, the judge said something about in the preliminary instructions, you say, wait a minute, wait a minute, those were preliminary. They were just talking points. They weren't things that are going to relate to this case. It's just a very matter -- and I'm not -- we're disregarding that altogether. I'm going back to the black Impala. We're just going back to the idea that there can be things that suggest that an inference can withdrawn. But I don't know, and you don't know.

What we do know is, what? That you're going to get to see the evidence that's properly admissible in the case, and you can draw those inferences, and that's an important point, that are logical and appropriate in the case because we understand that a jury can draw inferences, but you're not required to. So we're going to wait and see on that. So I'm going to ask you, erase mode. We're going to be back to that one. We're going to take that one out because that's not something we're going to talk about here. And if somebody brings it up and says I said, you're not

going to hear me saying that in the final instructions. I'll tell you that right how. It's not going to be there. It's not going to be there because we're leaving every issue, every issue regarding the facts in the case entirely up to you. I never want to suggest anything about those things. That's just not my business. That's not my job, and I should not do that.

Now, we said that we would take about a 20-minute break, and we will check with counsel. At least 20 minutes.

I need to make sure that everything is arranged that we need to have arranged earlier. It is. Good. Absolutely.

So we're going to let you be excused to the jury room, and this is a 20-minute break, but you may also need to visit with someone who needs to go over some information with you there, and please give that person your undivided attention. Thank you all very much.

(Jury out at 2:22 p.m.)

THE COURT: Let me see counsel briefly at side-bar and then we can have a break and come back for opening statements.

(At side-bar on the record.)

THE COURT: All I can do is hit the erase button, and I know you don't agree. Now I've got poor Mr. Moore in this other case. They did have a black Impala. I promise. They didn't show Mr. Moore. They just showed that black

### PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS 41 1 Impala. 2 MR. BALLIN: All right. So a couple of weeks 3 ago. 4 THE COURT: You know about Mr. Moore's case. 5 you don't. 6 MR. BALLIN: A couple of weeks ago, a landscape 7 company that does my yard put these fancy plants in my yard, 8 and I'm thinking I wonder how much this is going to cost me. 9 And the reason I'm asking is they look like the way they 10 are -- they're long and skinny, and I'm thinking the first 11 breeze that comes along, it's going to break, and it can't be 12 fixed. So lo and behold, what my fear was, the wind came and 13 this plant that cost me God knows how much money can't be 14 fixed even though --15 THE COURT: It's got a guarantee. They'll come 16 replant it. 17 MR. BALLIN: Even though I tried to upright it 18 and put it together, it just -- they took it out. 19 replaced it. So I say that, and certainly I heard Your Honor 20 tell them, in your words, hit the erase button. I must renew 21 my motion for a mistrial. 22 THE COURT: That's fine. 23 MR. SCHOLL: I join in on behalf of Mr. Grayson 24 also. 25 THE COURT: Absolutely. You're going to feel

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

really funny when you get a not guilty in this case, but I'm okay with that. I'm sort of kidding. I'm just saying, but then the Government is going to say, oh, we should have granted that motion. No, I understand what you're saying. It's all I can do under the circumstances. I wasn't intending -- you know, we have lots of illustrations and lots of things that happen here but that was a little too close so we need to get away from it and give them some other thing that lets them understand that something might be circumstantial, but it's not conclusive. It doesn't tell us. Now, I know I think that you've been telling me, and I don't disagree the tape may not be great evidence. MR. PALMER: No, that's why we spent so much time on the motion to exclude. THE COURT: I know, and I understand that. MR. PALMER: If you want to revisit that. THE COURT: No, no. That's been well done. Everybody did a good job on that. MR. SCHOLL: The concern is although it was a

good circumstantial example, this --

THE COURT: I could have done the rain thing. thought about doing that one, the umbrella thing. Talking about the raincoat. I could have done that.

MR. SCHOLL: The video is sort of direct evidence of intent. It could be in this situation.

THE COURT: Well, I hear what you're saying. It could be.

MR. PALMER: That's what they're banking on.

MR. OLDHAM: Your Honor, frankly, just come on say it, I think their defense is going to be even if it sounds like that's what she's saying, that's not really what she's saying.

MR. PALMER: Exactly.

THE COURT: That's what I've understood what they were going to say all along. Am I wrong about that?

MR. BALLIN: No, sir.

MR. SCHOLL: My guy didn't know anything about it. I'm still back here. But I'm still in the middle of trial too. I'm in both places, Judge.

THE COURT: No, I understand. Sometimes you just have a lot of things that happen. There's circumstantial evidence in our cases, and sometimes we have to play the cards we've got, and I think the jury understands they're preliminary. They understand they're going to make all the fact determinations, and I'm not suggesting any fact that should be concluded, and that's all I can do. That's the truth. You know how much I don't care in that -- I don't mean this in a bad way. I care about the case, but I truly -- I leave it up to the jury. I'm happy to do that in every case, and I know that experienced Texas counsel, a lot

44

of times you're just really glad that's a jury. 1 2 MR. BALLIN: And I'm thinking about the 3 potential -- and on the tree thing --4 THE COURT: I've got a good nursery. 5 MR. BALLIN: I'm just thinking about the 6 potential sentence upon a conviction. It's a pretty stiff 7 quideline-wise. It's a ten-year statutory maximum and I 8 think the -- it just --9 THE COURT: This is a tough case. 10 MR. BALLIN: It's a tough case, and we all make 11 mistakes. I make mistakes every day. 12 THE COURT: I think I told them I did. That's 13 all I can do. 14 MR. BALLIN: But because of the potential 15 ramifications to our client, isn't the best, wisest thing to 16 do is to grant a mistrial so we don't have this --17 THE COURT: It's an interesting question, and we 18 always think about that. I don't disagree that I've -- you 19 know, anything you indicate I'm going to give very serious 20 thought to. I think the answer is kind of what I've said a 21 little bit already. 22 First of all, it's a preliminary instruction. 23 You tell them that's not going to govern what they do. 24 Absolutely. Then you come back and tell them, don't think

about that, and they know they weren't supposed to and let's

25

## PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS

just talk about what would constitute evidence that would be -- what happens in other cases. It's not direct evidence. This does sound like more direct evidence in the case, but I can't -- I just -- you know, I worry about always -- I worry about always expecting a level of perfection that I'm probably incapable of achieving, and I understand that. So I always look to you guys to help us get to the best place.

I don't think a mistrial is the best thing in this case. I think that we have done what we needed to do, and we're at a stage where we've done all we can do. And also I look out there and I think, you know something, there's a lot that's been invested by all the parties in this case to get to this point, including your clients. And I worry about things like they've got a good jury. They've got a very thoughtful jury. This jury is going to listen very carefully to everything that you say. I'm not sure who is going to be saying it.

And I'm very comforted by that fact. And I know that at the end of the case, we will give the instructions that they will follow. So I think we can -- if you will help us, and I really invite you to do this, to make sure that in the final instructions if there's anything else that we need to say, I'll say it, I'll get it said. I think that for example as to Mr. Grayson, it would be really terrible to not let him go ahead and get this over with.

MR. SCHOLL: Mr. Grayson, he doesn't know a lot about the law or anything else, but he was paying attention to Your Honor's instructions, and that sort of peaked up at the same time Mr. Ballin peaked up and he grabbed my jacket. And then after Your Honor finished going, he goes, man, I don't want this jury. They just heard that that video was going to be her intent to do this. And then when I went back, he goes, Mike, I don't want this jury, they can't unhear what was just heard. That was his response to me.

Just putting that on the record because it became an immediate concern for him, and he's not a lawyer. He doesn't really even know anything about the instructions.

And so -- in fact, he lost his place when we were doing jury voir dire. But it came up that much for him enough to grab me and him make the independent comments to me about that.

what we've said, and I think that that's all we can do at this time. And if we get it wrong, we're very thankful we've got a Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. I'm not going to be offended. The idea, though, is we're all working hard to get a fair result in the case that's not influenced by anything inappropriately. And we're going to work hard on that, so just continue to give it some thought, and we'll get it worked out.

MR. LEVINE: May I add one thing?

THE COURT: Sure. And we're getting a little -
I'm getting beaten up by four lawyers instead of two.

MR. LEVINE: I know. Yes, Your Honor. You then told them that you're not sure that there's going to be a video in this case when the Court knows there's a video in this case.

THE COURT: Well, it hasn't been admitted yet.

It hasn't been received. And I can't say things like it's going to come in because I can't say that.

MR. LEVINE: I understand, Your Honor, but you also said you don't know and you mentioned video again, so now when they hear it, it's going to be there is a video.

MR. PALMER: Are you going to play it in your opening?

MR. OLDHAM: No.

THE COURT: He's not. Okay. I always tell everybody I can't do anything about the good facts or the bad facts in anybody's case. I don't have anything to do with that. That's up to the lawyers to deal with. My job is to make sure the jury makes the decision based solely on the evidence and the law. And if I make a mistake, we will tell the jury that we need to not consider that and I have been confident for a long time and still confident that the jury will take ma instruction. Juries are good at that. They know they can't do it. And we have to have faith in the

```
PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS
                                                           48
             I think it will work just fine.
 1
 2
                 But we need to let everybody get a little bit of
 3
     a break. I know you've got to get ready for -- Government
 4
     has got to be ready. We have how many minutes before we
 5
     start back up, eight?
 6
                 CASE MANAGER: Seven now.
 7
                 MR. BALLIN: Can we have ten? We're going to
     take eight minutes.
 8
 9
                   (End of discussion at side-bar.)
10
          (A recess was taken from 2:33 p.m. to 2:43 p.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

# PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS 49 1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 4 I, TINA DuBOSE GIBSON, do hereby certify that the 5 foregoing 48 pages are, to the best of my knowledge, skill 6 and abilities, a true and accurate transcript from my 7 stenotype notes of the preliminary instructions held on the 28th day of March, 2024, in the matter of: 8 9 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 11 VS. 12 ASHLEY GRAYSON AND 13 JOSHUA GRAYSON 14 15 16 Dated this 28th day of March, 2024. 17 18 19 S/Tina DuBose Gibson 20 21 TINA DUBOSE GIBSON, RPR, RCR Official Court Reporter 22 United States District Court Western District of Tennessee 23 24

UNREDACTED TRANSCRIPT

25